A Juicy Scandal Brownell Tried to Hide But Adlai and the Democrats Ignore, See Page 2

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. IV, NO. 36 SEPTEMBER 24, 1956 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

The Campaign Is On—But What's It About?

The first question asked Stevenson at his press conference here last week was what he thought the overriding issue of the campaign. He supposed it was war and peace but added "I think it's very hard to select a single issue." The truth is that no overriding issue has appeared. For the Republicans the issue is Eisenhower. For the Democrats it is Nixon. For a while it looked as if the issue might be Hiss. Not since John W. Davis ran against Coolidge in 1924 has there been an election in which it was harder to determine just what the campaign was about—and then at least there was a third party ticket in the field with La Follette. It was really a confession when Adlai explained at Harrisburg, "when someone says to me that the two parties' programs are just about the same I say that so are two checks, signed by different people." Stevenson says "the question is which one can be cashed and which one will bounce." But maybe the real question lies in the fact that both are blank checks, and it is hard for the voter to determine just what he will be getting.

There may or may not be a new Nixon but there certainly is a new Adlai. He is not the figure he was four years ago. At Harrisburg he seemed the clever after dinner speaker; he appears to gravitate naturally to pleasant generalities. In the Washington press conference, he seemed only a more cultivated variety of a type one often encounters at the State Department, urbane but not very vital. The "amiable complacency" of which he accused the Republicans begins to seem a self-portrait. He even has a streak of fatuity, as in his Harrisburg climax: "So I say let us be up and doing, probing ceaselessly for solutions to today's problems." This might be termed an after dinner mint. His prepared answers were mostly exercises in evasion. A great crisis is developing abroad. If the British can debate it, why can't we? What is this coy business of its being "no secret" that he doesn't "think much of the recent conduct of foreign affairs" but is reserving comment till later? Surely there is a middle way between irresponsible utterance and choking into silence on the bi-partisan old school tie? There is also a crisis developing at home in the school situation. Stevenson has said the President has a duty to create a climate of compliance. So does Stevenson. But when Stevenson was asked what he would do as President, he couldn't say "with any precision" because he didn't know "what the precise facts" are. Does he need a CIA briefing on the race problem?

This caution may be politically wise, but it is not inspiring. It looks as though Stevenson has decided that his chances depend on an accumulation of petty or regional irritations rather than on any overriding issues, and that his best strategy is to say as little as possible that will antagonize anybody while he cashes in on the disaffection with the "ins." These tactics are tailor made for nonentities; they fit badly on a Stevenson, and they make one feel sad at a time when there has been such a vacuum of leadership.

On the other side, the Republicans are starting off slickly. Nixon at his own press conference the week before looked like the clean cut type of young man Fuller Brushing his way through college; he is competent, and knows what he is doing. It was smart to accept Stevenson's reply on Hiss and to turn the other cheek to Mrs. Roosevelt; the latter's performance on *Meet the Press* the Sunday before, incidentally, was magnificent. I wish she were running for President instead of Adlai. The Republican slogan, "the best four years of our lives" should not be underrated. Nixon is out to create a new picture of himself in the Eisenhower image and may succeed. "Peace and prosperity" may keep Ike in the White House, though it will not be enough to recapture Congress. Eisenhower's TV kick-off speech had the true synthetic Madison Avenue flavor. As one heard Eisenhower repeat that he had never tired or ceased in the search for peace, one could not help but think that he never has worked half as hard on peace as he has on his golf. The Eisenhower peace record is inflated far beyond reality; he was on the edge of war in Indo-China; he went to Geneva most reluctantly; his big play—"aerial inspection"—was razzle-dazzle. No one knows—himself included—what he is likely to do over Suez after November. He is personally for peace but has yet to show readiness or capacity for the hard work and hard thinking required to unravel the complexities of getting it.

Do We or Nasser Menace the World Interest in Suez?

Tepid little differences do appear in the carefully qualified statements of Eisenhower and Stevenson on such subjects as the draft and H-bomb tests. These gentlemanly controversies appear pigmy against the backdrop of what the Suez and school crisis may hold in store. To millions now awakening to political consciousness these issues take on a tragically oversimplified form more dangerous to us in the long run future than the Communism with which we are obsessed. The poorer and darker peoples of the earth see only that we find new ways to keep dark children from our schools and mobilize all our resources to keep a dark people's ruler from using one of his country's advantages for the benefit of his own people. We draw wealth and power from the possession of all sorts of monopolies and gifts of fortune, but when one turns up in Africa it must be "international." The giant shadow of ancient resentments fall unseen across the London conference.

From this perspective, in always hungry eyes, Suez will seem such a *de luxe* crisis. It will seem truly wonderful how comfortably the rich West manages to ride out for its Armag-

(*Continued on Page Four*)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Juicy Campaign Scandal Brownell Tried to Hide But the Democrats Ignore

The Contractor's Diary on How To Clear with GOP Chairman Hall

Whether from healthy discretion or gentlemanly anemia, Stevenson and the Democrats seem strikingly uninterested in what appears to be the juiciest scandal which has yet turned up in the campaign. This is the Cremer diary, which says that GOP Chairman Hall arranged for party rake-offs before clearing a $43,000,000 contract to expand the government owned Nicaro nickel plant in Cuba. The scandal involves not only Hall but Attorney General Brownell, who stepped in and refused to let a Congressional investigating committee see the diary when its existence became known last February. Excerpts from the diary were released to the press by Congressman Jack Brooks (D. Tex.), chairman of the House Special Government Activities subcommittee, for publication, Saturday, Sept. 15. Stevenson was in Washington that day. The *Washington Post* was one of the few papers in the country to play the story on page one. (The *New York Times* and the *Herald-Tribune* buried it inside). Stevenson was a guest that night of the *Post's* publisher, Philip Graham. But when Warren Unna of the *Post's* staff asked Stevenson about the story at his big press conference Monday, Adlai pleaded ignorance.

A Bipartisan Hush Up?

The form in which Unna put the question reflected gossip on the Hill that Brooks had been under pressure from the Democrats as well as the Republicans to lay off. "Sir," Unna framed his query, "reports over the week-end brought out that Chairman Hall was involved in the award of a nickel plant expansion in Cuba. So far there has been a reservation on the part of Democrats to point to this or ask any searching questions. There are some accounts that the Democrats are so reluctant because of their own part when their Administration was in power. Is this true?" "Well," Stevenson replied, "I am unable to answer the question, sir, because I am not familiar with the case or the instance to which you refer. I just don't know what the Democrats are going to do about that. So far as I am concerned, I have no information." This seems remarkably uninformed for so well-informed a candidate.

It may be that Democratic as well as Republican bodies are buried in the Nicaro nickel story. Or it may just be that Adlai is too fastidious. The plant itself goes back to World War II. The Brooks investigation last winter led to the resignation of Edward Mansure as administrator of the General Services Administration. The diary originally came from the files of Randall Cremer, formerly executive vice president of the Frederick Snare Company, who testified before the Brooks committee last winter. The excerpts obtained by Brooks despite Brownell's refusal to let him have the document cover a trip Cremer made to Washington on June 3, 1954, to get the $43,000,000 Nicaro expansion contract for his company. The excerpts have been so meagerly reprinted in most papers, give so vivid a picture of how business has been done in GOP Washington, and provide so engaging a sidelight on the self-righteous references of Brownell to Truman era corruption, that we give the salient portions here for the delectation of our readers:

"8:40 a.m. Arrived Washington Airport—Took taxi to GSA [Government Services Administration].

"9:00 a.m. Called on Pinkley [James P., director of the Industrial Reserve Division of GSA]. Told him of unsuccessful efforts to reach him by phone. Says he has been run ragged, phones tapped (including home) and doesn't know which way to turn. Gave him my telephone numbers and asked him to call me collect any time from a public booth. He said this would solve many of his problems. Has wanted to keep us posted but afraid to talk over phone. . . . Perhaps it's nothing but a bad case of nerves but his condition is serious. Asked him what is holding up award. He says (1) the National Committee. . . . Hopes we can get Hall's [Chairman Leonard Hall of the Republican National Committee] clearance today—thinks now this is essential. . . .

"9:50 a.m. Called Mr. Mansure, told him I should be through with Hall by about 12. Asked me to call then. . . .

"10:00 a.m. Took taxi to Cafritz building, 1625 Eye St., NW. Had to wait 15 minutes to see Hall. Latter very pleasant but wanted all the facts. Asked about our special qualifications for Nicaro. . . . He wanted to know about history of the company and its officers. Told him this in full, also the politics of all of them. . . . Told him about our 52 years in Cuba and the fine organization we have built up there. . . .

The Right Kind of People

"Hall then asked for information re support of the Party. Went over this again, and assured him we have no Democrats in the higher brackets and believe practically none in the lower. . . . He spoke of bonds, insurance, etc., and asked whether we would be inclined to place this where it will do the most good. I assured him we want to work with him on this and will do anything within reason. . . .

"He seemed much pleased with all this and said he is satisfied we are the right kind of people. I asked him if we had qualified. He replied—'You certainly have.' . . ."

When the press reached Chairman Hall the night these excerpts were released, his comment was "I can't help what anyone writes in his personal diary." This is not strictly true. We can see the day when applicants for government contracts are asked to file a bond guaranteeing that they will not keep a diary of the negotiations. In the meantime, history is grateful to Mr. Cremer even if the Democrats don't seem to be.

Pious Reflections

The longer we meditate on Nixon's recent praise of the American Legion for its "Back to God" movement, the more convinced we are that the only way to save religion in this country is to launch a movement to keep some people away from God.

We sense a kindred spirit in the Baptist Joint Committee on Capital Affairs whose latest bulletin asks some wry questions about the new law making "In God We Trust" our national motto. It asks, "Might we expect to reduce armaments, raise our ethics. . . ." as a result of the new motto?

One way to determine the answer would be for church people to sponsor a bill at the next session of Congress cutting the military budget in half on the ground that we now trust in God.

What makes men distinguished by their materialism, their hatred of progress, their support of thought control and their devotion to ever bigger bombs talk so much about God? The real assumption behind the religious drive underway in this country today is not flattering to religion. It is the belief that the best way to keep the human herd docile is to drive it regularly to church.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Stevenson Opposes the Walter Bill to Permit Kangaroo Court Procedures

Suits Filed by The Monmouth Eight Dramatize Security-Loyalty Idiocies

In his speech across the river at Walnut Hill, Va., last week-end, Adlai Stevenson pledged himself not to support the Walter bill or any similar measure to circumvent the Supreme Court's decision in the Cole case. This decision would seem to limit the security program to "sensitive" jobs. It was good in the atmosphere of Washington to hear a Presidential candidate say, "We don't want to turn our public servants into a collection of weak and spineless conformists." This was strikingly different from Nixon's reference to the issue before the American Legion, when all the Republican candidate could see that was wrong with the security program were "occasional mistakes." We hope that Adlai will go further. Public education is needed. The Harry Cain affair offers a way to take the offensive against the Eisenhower Administration; the former Senator from Washington ought to be on the Democratic team, with a free hand to speak on security-loyalty abuses.

The fundamental issue on the procedural side is whether a man's reputation may be destroyed on the basis of secret evidence. Here there is no easy way to reconcile liberty and security. A choice must be made between justice to the individual or the security of the State, and the question is whether we shall go on resolving it—as all tyrannies, from Nero's Rome to Stalin's Moscow have resolved it—at the expense of the individual. The issue is dramatized by the suits which former Judge Thurman Arnold's law firm here has just filed on behalf of what might be called the Monmouth Eight—the eight civilian employes of the Army at Fort Monmouth who lost their jobs in the frenzy created by McCarthy in 1953. On this page we give samples of the kind of "allegations" bred by allowing an often politically illiterate and slightly wacky secret police to determine loyalty and security risks. They show that though McCarthy was defeated his standards are still being applied under Eisenhower and Brownell.

These cases go much beyond Cole's. They involve several scientists who have made distinguished contributions to military science. The loss of such abilities is the price paid for paranoid standards, and cowardly acquiescence in them. These men had access to "sensitive" data. They were employes of the Army, one of the 11 agencies specified in the Act of 1950 which allowed summary discharge. This sharply differentiates these cases from Cole's, which was that of a minor employe in the non-enumerated and non-sensitive Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The suits challenge the constitutionality of any act or executive order which permits discharge as a security or loyalty risk without giving the employe an opportunity to face his accusers. The suits reveal that in these cases not only the accusers were kept secret but so were the judges. The accused had no chance to argue their cases before the Army Security Review Board because the Army—to protect Board members from McCarthy—decreed in 1953 that henceforth their identities were not to be disclosed.

It should be no surprise that anti-Semitism may have played its covert role here. All eight are Jewish. The allegations sampled in this page reflect that kind of mentality. The questions put at the so-called hearings are incredible. One electrical engineer was asked whether he believed in God and whether his parents were religious. A $3,000 a year clerk-typist was asked what she thought of public power and how her mother and father voted in the last election. The voluminous complaints filed in District Court here uncover a festering nest of idiocy as well as injustice in the Army's security procedures. It is worth recalling that not a single indictment much less conviction emerged from all the Monmouth hullabaloo, and that none of these eight faced so definite an allegation as membership, past or present, in the Communist party.

Wives As Security Hazards

"In addition to the written charges . . . the Legal Adviser to the [Army Security] Board orally advised Plaintiff's wife . . . that the Board had secret information to the effect that she (i) had advocated the necessity for a revolution in the United States, (ii) had taken a stand against a 'screening of school books and screening of speakers' and (iii) had advocated that the U.S. should avoid a war with Russia by turning its 'other cheek to Russia'. Plaintiff's wife, a registered Republican, denied the truth of the accusations."

—Complaint of Melvin Morris, one of the Monmouth Eight, against the Secretary of the Army.

"That you married and have continuously resided with Alice Chelimer Ducore, who: . . . Is reported to have expressed pro-Communist statements."

—Allegations Against Harold Ducore, as given in his suit against the Secretary of the Army.

Samples of The "Allegations" on Which the Monmouth Eight Lost Their Jobs

"It has been reported that you . . . thought that the Russian government had the best method of handling its people and that the U.S. government was too liberal."

"You failed to list on your Statement of Personal History dated 29 December 1948 your membership in the Young Peoples Socialist League from 1936-1939."

"You and your parents reportedly attended meetings at Carpenter's Hall, 5th Street, Lakewood, N. J., which meetings were believed to be Communistic in nature."

"While attending Brooklyn College you were a member of the Physics Club in 1949, of which Professor Melba Phillips was the faculty adviser. It is reported that Professor Phillips had been dropped from her position at Brooklyn College because of her failure to testify before a Congressional committee."

"You have maintained a close relationship with your brother, Seymour B....., who is reported: . . . To have declared the Communist party an ineffectual party that should be permitted to operate legally and not be suppressed."

"It has been reported that in 1946 and 1947, the name of your mother, Sara C....., appeared as a registrant with the American Labor Party."

"Reportedly you were nicknamed 'Red' and 'Commie' while in school because you continually favored Russia. . . ."

"You were employed . . . by the Egg Local No. 1, Farmers Union, Lakewood, N. J., a subsidiary of the Eastern Division of the Farmers Union which purportedly has been used by the Communist Party to publicize and carry out Communist Party farm policies."

"It has been reported that in July 1946 you attended a social affair given for the benefit of Russian children and to collect clothing for the people of Russia."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*Continued from Page One*)

eddons. The non-Egyptian pilots were given three years severance pay by the old Canal company as inducement to quit, and compensation for any furniture and household goods left behind them. Never have labor relations been so enlightened. Britain and France are being offered the prospect of dollar aid in the neighborhood of a half billion dollars a year by Mr. Dulles if they will promise not to try and shoot their way through the Canal but boycott it instead. The Gospel itself never envisioned such blessedness for pacifists. The need for oil is made the excuse for all kinds of Western claims in the Middle East but suddenly it appears that by the mere lifting of production quotas—the turn of a spigot—we can produce at home enough oil to make up not only for the longer haul around the Cape but even for all the petrol of Araby should its sheikhs join Nasser. The embattled oil companies, who fear that nationalization of the Canal company may lead to nationalization of their wells, will be allowed if necessary to raise domestic prices in compensation—for the loss of the extra profit they make by selling cheaper Arab oil at the same fixed Gulf price as the more expensive domestic product. In what gilded chariots we modern Romans ride forth to battle!

So much escapes our lordly attention. We speak so easily of providing $500,000,000 or $600,000,000 *a year* for a Canal boycott; the whole Aswan dam project, which could have been a monument to our magnanimity, would have required only $400,000,000 in hard currency over the 12 to 16 years required for its completion. We speak of Western Europe's dependence on the Suez for Middle Eastern oil. India, Indonesia, Malaya and the East are as dependent on the great ditch for the commerce which provides their bread. Mr. Dulles says 95 percent of the "users" are represented at London; but he equates "users" with owners of tonnage. What of the countries like India which have to use the tonnage of other nations? Has the West the right to boycott the Canal for its own purposes if this means ruining the waterway for the East? Why can't they let Nasser run the Canal and wait until there is abuse of power—in which case Eastern and Western nations may be united against him? Is it not because the real issue lies in Anglo-American fear that nationalization will spread, the French folly in believing that war on Egypt may make up for the lack of political wisdom in Algeria? The West is ready to wreck the canal if necessary (Dulles by boycott, London and Paris by war) to smash Nasser. Is this upholding international interest in a world waterway?

The Right to Keep Other Human Beings "Niggers"

Instead of a slow but smooth road to integration we are seeing the beginnings of a counter offensive. The painful scenes at Clay and Sturgis, where colored children were turned away, are only the dramatic evidence of a wider tide. The Virginia legislature, like so many others in the South, is enacting nullification. A racist Congressional committee began hearings in the District of Columbia last week designed to give integration a bad name. Reactionary publications like *U.S. News and World Report* sprout scientific studies to show that the Negro is intrinsically inferior. The counter offensive is aided by the form of the Supreme Court decree which depends on private litigation by poor and humble people like Mrs. Gordon. Where are the Negroes of the South to find funds for new long drawn out legal battles, especially if by law and unofficial boycott the NAACP is forced out of the South? The counter offensive is also aided because neither major party takes integration with sufficient seriousness; no foreign emergency more clearly called for bipartisanship. But the only bipartisanship visible is an ultimate indifference.

If one listens to the murmurings of the mob in Clay and Sturgis, it is clear that what the white supremacist is fighting for is the right to keep other human beings "niggers", to brand them from childhood. The children who play together must separate at the school door. The darker must learn from his first days that he is an inferior, and not just an inferior but a "nigger." On this there can be no morally palatable compromise as there was none on slavery. What Plutarch tells us of the Spartans and their helots is still the instinctive logic of the white mob, sensing an "uppity nigger." To make a child a "nigger" is the worst genocide. It is the genocide of the spirit. This is what all Americans of good will in our generation are called upon to fight.

Please Help Us Reach A Wider Audience This Year

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.
Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

9/24/56

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S. E.
Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Washington, D. C.
Post Office

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED